



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## NOTES ON THE NAME יהוה

By GEORGE F. MOORE

### V. PORCHETUS DE SALVATICIS: JOHOVAH<sup>1</sup>

In writings on the history of the pronunciation *Jehovah* it is sometimes noted in passing that this hybrid form was used before Galatinus by Porchetus de Salvaticis (or Sylvaticis), but no one seems to have pursued the inquiry farther. The source of this piece of learning, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is an editorial note on Drusius, *Tetragrammaton*, c. 19, in the Amsterdam edition of the *Critici Sacri* (1698), Vol. I, Part 2. Drusius wrote: "Fieri potest ut errem, tamen inclino ut credam parentem lectionis *Jehova* Petrum Galatinum esse," on which the editor remarks in a bracketed note: "Ante Galatinum usus fuit hoc nomine Porchetus, qui scribit *Jehova* semel aut bis, alias semper appellat, *Jod, He, Vau, He*. Scripsit autem auctor ille anno Christi 1303, uti patet ex capitulo sexto. In eodem est *Juhuda* pro *Jehuda*. *Johovha* [*sic!*] est cap. 13. part. 1. Sic *Juhuda* & *Jehuda*. *ibid.*"

Reland, in his reprint of Drusius in the *Decas exercitationum philologicarum de vera pronuntiatione nominis Jehova*, Utrecht, 1707, took over the bracketed notes of the preceding editor along with Drusius's own annotations; but in this instance, by typographical error, the first bracket is lacking.

Porchetus's *Victoria* is a comparatively rare book, and in my earlier contribution on this subject in *Old Testament and Semitic Studies* (I, 147) I could do no better than quote the above statement after Reland. A few months ago I had opportunity to examine a copy of the work in the Royal Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in Munich with results which seem of sufficient interest to be worth recording.

The full title of the volume is: *Victoria Porcheti adversus impios Hebraeos, in qua tum ex sacris literis, tum ex dictis Talmud, ac Caballistarum, et aliorum omnium authorum, quos Hebraei recipiunt, monstratur veritas catholicae fidei.*

<sup>1</sup> See *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper*, I, 143-64 = *American Journal of Theology*, Vol. XII (1908), 34-52; *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. XXV (1909), 312-18.

Ex recognitione R. P. Aug. Iustiniani ordinis Praedicatorii, episcopi Nebiensis.

Francois Regnault. Cum gratia et privilegio. [Paris, 1520].

Porchetus was a Carthusian, native of Genoa, who flourished at the end of the thirteenth century; the *Victoria* was finished in the year 1303. The author acknowledges his large indebtedness to Raymundus Martini, which is indeed everywhere apparent, but his work is not a mere abridgment of the *Pugio Fidei*. The Tetragrammaton is sometimes printed in Hebrew characters and then spelled out, e.g., “יהוה, id est Jod, He, Uau, He,” “יהוה, Jod, He, Uau, He, quod est Sem hammeforas, i.e. nomen expositum”; more frequently it is simply spelled, “Jod, He, Uau, He.” In several places, however, it is written as the author pronounced it. Thus in Part ii, c. 1, “in quo probatur, quod Messias est Deus,” arguing from Jer. 23:5 f., he writes: “Ecce dies venient, dicit Dominus, et suscitabo vel erigam David germen justum. Regnabit rex et intelliget et faciet judicium et justitiam in terra. In diebus ejus salvabitur Juhuda et Israel habitabit ad fiduciam. Et hoc nomen ejus quo vocabunt eum Johouah, i.e. Deus, justus noster.” Similarly on Jer. 33:16: “In diebus illis salvabitur Juhuda et Hierusalem habitabit ad fiduciam. Et iste qui vocabit eam Johoua [sic], supple est, vel Jod, He, Uau, He, justus noster.” Again (fol. 57): “Et est vocans regem Messiam nomine suo. Et quod est nomen eius? Johouah, vel Jod, He, Uau, He, nomen eius, sicut dictum est Exod. 15, Dominus vir pugnae, Jod, He, Uau, He, nomen ipsius. Et de rege Messia scriptum est, Hier. 23, Et hoc nomen ejus quo vocabunt eum, vel quo appellabunt eum, Jod, He, Uau, He, justus noster.” And again (fol. 58), “Hinc reducendum est quicquid praemisum est in rationis ordinem atque dicendum: Cum gloriosius nomen dei de cunctis nominibus, videlicet Johouah, vel Jod, He, Uau, He, vel nomen quatuor literarum, quod pro sui dignitate nullus praesumit Judaeus suis antedictis quatuor literis nominare, sed dicunt loco ipsius Adonai, ut supra dictum est—si istud inquam tam gloriosum nomen soli deo convenit,” etc.

In two places (fol. 60) I have noted *Ihouah*: viz, “Ihouah, vel Jod, He, Uau, He,” and, “habetur quod Deus est vocans Messiam nomine suo, quod est Ihouah, vel Jod, He, Uau, He”; but this

is more probably a printer's error than an inconsistency of the author, since in the same quotation on fol. 57 he writes *Johouah*. *Jehova* I was unable to discover anywhere.

The regular form in the *Victoria* is, therefore, *Jōhouah*. That this is the author's way of writing it, and not the addition of a scribe or the editor, is certain. Porchetus, who was evidently a competent Hebrew scholar, considered the transcription of Hebrew words carefully; to discriminate the Hebrew sibilants he even employs a character not in the usual Latin alphabet (ç), the sound of which he explains; he regularly indicates ʔ by doubling the vowel, and expressly cautions copyists against altering his transliteration. The form *Johouah* is in conformity with his rendering of other Hebrew names, for example, *Juhuda*, wherein he follows accurately the rule of the old Jewish grammarians that the reduced vowel before a guttural should take the color of the following full vowel.<sup>2</sup>

The last of the longer passages quoted above from Porchetus (fol. 58) is transcribed by him from the *Pugio Fidei* (see *Old Testament and Semitic Studies*, I, 146), where two manuscripts of the *Pugio* itself have *Yehova*. The pronunciation *Yohova* is also found in one of the codices of the *Pugio* in another place. This pronunciation is itself an indication of relative antiquity: the tradition of the Massoretes of Tiberias, transmitted by the North African and Spanish grammarians, was lost in the succeeding centuries, and the custom of uttering the reduced vowel as a kind of short obscure *e* established itself. *Johouah* is the older and more learned, *Jehouah* the later transcription. I see no reason to change the opinion which I expressed in a former article that *Yehova* and *Yohova* in the *Pugio* came, not from the author, but from the hands of copyists. It is certain, however, that only a generation later, Porchetus himself, with deliberate reflection transcribed the name *Johouah*.

## VI. THE DATE OF THE FIRST EDITION OF GALATINUS

In my former article I had occasion to note that the *De arcanis catholicae veritatis* of Petrus Galatinus was published in 1518, not in 1520, as has been frequently repeated in modern times.<sup>3</sup> Professor B. B. Warfield, of Princeton, was kind enough to call my attention

<sup>2</sup> Ibn Ezra, *Ṣaḥūth*, 1 b, after Jehuda Ḥayyuj; the rule comes from the Massoretes of Tiberias, and is formulated by Ben Asher in the *Dikdūke ha-Te'amim*.

<sup>3</sup> *Old Testament and Semitic Studies*, I, 145.

to the fact that quotations are sometimes made from an edition described as published at Bari in 1516. Thus F. Prat, in the article "Jehovah" in Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible* (II, 1224): "Il est faux que le plagiaire Galatin soit l'auteur de la prononciation Jehovah. Il la donne au contraire comme connue et reçue de son temps. Cf. Arcana cathol. veritatis, Bari, 1516, I, x (il-y-a par erreur deux chapitres x, c'est le premier), p. 77."<sup>4</sup>

Panzer, *Annales Typographici*, Vol. VI, p. 174, records such an edition: "Petrus Galatinus de arcanis catholicae veritatis. Barii MDXVI. fol. Bibl. P. Nor."<sup>5</sup> Neither the British Museum, nor the Royal Library in Berlin, which has a still more complete series of the editions (six in all, the last in 1672), has an edition earlier than that of Ortona, 1518. In Munich I found in the catalogue of the Hof- und Staatsbibliothek an edition entered "sine loco et anno," with a penciled note, "Bari, 1516." Examination of the volume showed, however, that it was the edition of Ortona, 1518. The error of the bibliographers has a very simple, if not altogether creditable, explanation. The title-page of the volume bears no date. On fol. 309b, at the bottom of the page, stands this *explicit*: "Peractum est (diuina opitulante gratia) opus de arcanis catholicae ueritatis, ex iudaicis codicibus nuper excerptum, etc. Barii: Anno uirginei partus. M.D.XVI. pridie nonas septembris," etc. On the top of the next page (fol. 310a): "Impressum uero Orthonae maris, summa cum diligentia per Hieronymum Suncinum: Anno christianae nativitatis. M.D.VIII. quinto decimo kalendas martias," etc. There follows a list of *correctiones* about three pages long; then, without pagination, the letter of Pope Leo X, "Dilecto filio Petro Galatino," dated, "Die IX Aprilis. M.D.XVIII.," signed "Ja. Sadoletus."<sup>6</sup> It is plain that the words on fol. 309b refer, not to the printing or publication of the book, but to the author's completion of his work at Bari in September, 1516.<sup>7</sup> The printer's colophon is on the following page, "Impressum uero Orthonae . . . . 1518." It is easy to see how in a hasty inspection of the book

<sup>4</sup> The page reference proves that the edition Prat actually had before him was that of Basel, 1550, not the *editio princeps*.

<sup>5</sup> The reference is to Panzer's own catalogue of the Public Library of Nürnberg. The edition of 1518 does not appear in Panzer either under "Ortona" or in the index.

<sup>6</sup> This *privilegium* was not reprinted in the subsequent editions (Clément, X, 126).

<sup>7</sup> Galatinus was Definitor of his order for the province of Bari.

the latter might be overlooked and the date on fol. 309 taken for the year of publication and as a matter of fact this happened more than once.

Panzer was not the first to make this mistake. In the catalogue of the Bodleian Library by Thomas Hyde, issued in 1674 (p. 273), three editions of Galatinus are entered, viz., Basel, 1550 (under the altered title of that edition), and, without indication of place, editions of 1516 and 1603. According to Clément the error was repeated in Robert Fysher's catalogue of the same library in 1738. Clément also notes that the catalogue of the Leyden Library (1716) ascribed the first edition to 1515 (which is the date affixed to the letter of the Emperor Maximilian to Galatinus urging him to publish a defense of Reuchlin, printed among the front matter of the *Arcana*), and supposes it to be a different work from that contained in the Basel edition of 1561. These errors and their origin were long ago exposed with gentle irony in David Clément's *Bibliothèque curieuse historique et critique*, IX (1769), 25 ff. Esser, in Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlexikon*, IX, 1914, cites Clément, but has evidently not profited by his learning, for he goes on to say that the *Arcana* "erschien zuerst zu Ortona 1518 (schon 1516 im Drucke fertiggestellt)," notwithstanding the fact that the title-page of the *Arcana* and the notes of the author and the printer on fol. 309 and 310 are reproduced in full by Clément.

The facts are accurately stated in Wadding, and in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina*, IV (Hamburg, 1735), 11, who writes: "Prima editio operis jussu Leonis X suscepti et anno 1516 absoluti vidit lucem Orthonae maris Adriatici, 1518, fol."

## VII. LUTHER AND PORCHETUS

In an article referred to above, I pointed out that Luther in a sermon delivered in November, 1526, and printed in 1527, employs the name *Jehovah* without comment or explanation, as if it were familiar to his hearers. It is not without interest in this connection to note that Luther was acquainted with the *Victoria* of Porchetus, and not only cited it by the author's name, but translated into German a considerable part of one chapter of the book in a polemic pamphlet, *Vom Schem Hamphoras und Geschlecht Christi*, Matt. 1,

published in 1543. My acquaintance with Luther's writings is not sufficient to permit me to say whether there is earlier evidence of Luther's acquaintance with Porchetus, and the indexes here give no light. It is at least an interesting coincidence that the passage in Jer. 23 which is the text of Luther's sermon is one on which Porchetus dwells at length.

In the pamphlet cited (Walch, XX, 2564), discussing the Tetragrammaton, Luther cites Jerome *Ad Marcellam* for the ten names of God, which he says Jerome enumerates as follows, "El, Elohim, Elohe, Zebaoth, Eljon, Ehje, Adonai, Ja, Jehova, Schadai," and in the sequel gives an etymological explanation of the name Jehovah. Whether Luther had an edition of Jerome's Epistles in which the name stood written *Jehova*, in place of the usual Jod, He, Vau, He, or whether he himself resolved the abbreviation, I am unable to judge.

#### VIII. JOHANN WESSEL: JOHAVAH

In his life of Johann Wessel, Ullmann writes (*Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, II, 442, n.): "Als lebendige Bezeichnungen der verschiedenen Seiten des göttlichen Wesens sind ihm daher auch die einzelnen Namen Gottes, vorzüglich im alten Testament, sehr wichtig und bedeutungsvoll, und er stellt häufige, wenngleich nicht immer ganz befriedigende, Betrachtungen darüber an, hauptsächlich über den Namen Jehovah." Similarly, p. 463: "Besonders hebt Wessel in platonischer Weise das in sich nothwendige, nach aussen vollkommen unbedingte, absolute und unveränderliche Seyn Gottes hervor, welches auch im alten Testament durch den Namen Jehovah bezeichnet werde"; referring in a note to "De Caus. Incarnat. Cap. 4. p. 419. De Orat. III, 11. p. 74. IV,<sup>8</sup> 13. p. 78." The reader of these sentences could hardly fail to infer that Wessel (died 1489), one of the most noteworthy of the fifteenth century precursors of the Reformation, used the name Jehovah in his writings. In view of Luther's relation to Wessel, and especially of the fact that some of the writings of Wessel were published at Wittenberg in 1522,<sup>9</sup> this would be interesting if true. Unfortunately it is not

<sup>8</sup> Error for III, 13.

<sup>9</sup> *Farrago rerum theologicarum uberrima*.—An edition of this work issued in the same year at Basel contains a letter of Luther (ed. Groningen, 1614, p. 854), in which he says that if he had read Wessel's writings earlier his enemies might have thought that he had got all his ideas from Wessel, so closely were they akin in spirit.

true. In *De causis incarnationis*, c. iv, Wessel discusses Exod. 3:14, criticizing Jerome's translation, "Ego sum qui sum," which he says the Jews ridicule. It should be rendered, "Ero qui ero," and in the sequel, "Ero misit me ad vos." But the name Jehovah does not occur, nor in this place even the words of the Hebrew text "*Ehejeh aser Ehejeh*" about which the author has a good deal to say in other writings. In *De oratione*, Bk. iii, cc. 11 and 13; Bk. iv, cc. 9 and 10, however, he frequently transliterates the Tetragrammaton, and uniformly writes *Iohavah*.

Wessel had acquired some acquaintance not only with Greek but with Hebrew, whether, as Hardenberg says, from monks who had lived "beyond the seas" or, as Ullmann thinks more likely, from Jews in Cologne (*op. cit.*, p. 314), is uncertain. From the specimens of his erudition scattered through his writings it is plain that his knowledge of Hebrew was not very profound, and in particular his notions of Hebrew pronunciation are decidedly at sea. Some of the errors are clearly to be attributed, not to the author, but to his editor or printers, as when on p. 72 the Hebrew equivalents of "our father, our brother, our lover," are said to be *Ahim, Ahinu, Abahim* (with a closer approximation to correctness, p. 98, *Abinu, Achinu, Achabinu*); but the author is doubtless responsible for the transliterations *Rucha, Eloha* (repeatedly), for *Ruah, Eloah*—a mistake a man would hardly make who had had even elementary instruction in pronunciation from a Jewish teacher. One more example must suffice:<sup>10</sup> "Manifeste Salomon, Proverb. 8, quando dicit, *Iehavriel ohabe Ies* [יְהוֹבְרִיֵּל אוֹהֵבֵי יֵשׁ, Prov. 8:21], ponit *Ies* nomen Dei substantivum, sicut *Eloha, Iah, & Iohavah*. Sunt ergo praeter pluralia de *El & Eloha*, sex nomina substantiva apud Hebraeos; *El, Eloha, Elohim, Iah, Ies, Iohavah, Eheje, Aser, Ehejeh*."

If Wessel's Hebrew stood examination better, we might be tempted to conjecture that he wrote *Iohovah*, like Porchetus, and lay the consistent *Iohavah* at the door of the printers; as the facts are, it is more probable that the blunder is the author's own. However that may be, the name of Wessel is to be added to the list of Christian scholars who tried, with varying degrees of success, to pronounce the Tetragrammaton as it was written in their Bibles.

<sup>10</sup> *De oratione*, Bk. v, c. 10.